among many of the Stratiomyidae, where the second vein confessedly has assumed the position of a branch of the third.

It is perhaps rather a bold opinion, but I am, nevertheless, inclined to it, that the Phoridae are really members of the Nemocera. The venation of the family is quite identical with that of *Aspistes* of the Bibionidae, for instance, and is easily explainable on this assumption, but utterly impossible from any other. The fact that the Phoridae have two-jointed palpi, while all the Cyclorrhapha have but a single joint, eliminates them I believe absolutely from membership in that group. The only diptera, aside from certain Nemocera, having two-jointed palpi, so far as my observation and reading go, are the Leptidae, Stratiomyidae, Tabanidae, Pantophthalmidae, Bombyliidae, some Asilidae, Apiocera and the Phoridae. I am not sure about the Empididae. The phorid antennae do not seem to me to offer insuperable objections to the location of the family among the Nemocera. So far as I am aware the first antennal joint in these flies is supposed to be absolutely wanting, the second much reduced in size. Assuming that the so-called third joint is in reality the second joint, it does not require much imagination to conceive that the, at least three-jointed, arista is in reality the whole flagellum of the Nemocera. And we have the Orphnephilidae to help us out in this assumption, where practically the only difference is that of additional aristal joints. Schiner seems to have had the same idea in his association of the Phoridae next to the Bibionidae in his Fauna Austriaca. On the other hand it is a well-known fact that the most primitive antennae of all diptera, so far as the number of distinct joints is concerned, with a few exceptions only among the Cecidomyidae, are found in the Brachycera, not the Nemocera! I may add by way of postscript, that Theobald's interpretation of the Culicid venation in his monograph is incorrect, and betrays a limited knowledge of the venation of allied diptera.